

REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated March 11, 2010. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-28 and 30-33 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claim 13 was objected.

Claims 1-8 and 9-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103.

With regard to the art rejections, the Office Action has cited Silhavy et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0108521 A1 ("Silhavy"), Reeves, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 7,178,163 B2 ("Reeves"), and Bhatia et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,249,375 B2 ("Bhatia").

Summary of Amendments

Claims 1-28 and 30-34 are currently pending following this response.

Claims 1, 9, 13, and 28 are currently amended herein.

Claim 34 is new.

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, and 31 were previously presented.

Claim 29 was previously canceled.

Claims 4-8, 15-22, 24-27, 30, 32, and 33 remain as originally submitted.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Applicant Initiated Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Abedin for his time and consideration of the arguments presented in the telephone interview on May 27, 2010. In the interview Applicants noted that Silhavy did not teach or suggest creating a new context with every invocation of the distinct server application by the client application. Also, in the interview, Examiner Abedin suggested amending the aforementioned limitation in order to provide further clarification. A detailed discussion of the differences between the applied art and the claim limitations follows.

In the interest of advancing prosecution, the claims have been amended herein as suggested by Examiner Abedin.

Summary of Response

This summary of the response is intended to aid the Examiner's understanding of the present application and how the claimed subject matter differs from the cited references. However, mere discussion of the content or meaning of the specification of the present application and/or of the cited references should not be expanded to an importation of additional limitations to the claims. Instead, the specific language of the claims and the allowability of the claims are addressed in detail separate from this summary of response.

The systems and methods of the pending application includes a security application program interface, an authentication authority, a store maintaining data, an application program interface, and a server application. The system and methods of the pending application provides a lightweight solution to enforcing security for

communications between disparate applications executing on different platforms that does not require each application to be reprogrammed to include an application interface for each individual application with which it must communicate. The system and methods of the pending application provides for platform and application independent tokens to be passed among disparate applications residing on different platforms so that security information can automatically be included with each call from one application to another. This mitigates the need for an application to be authenticated and authorized every time it sends a message to another application. Thus, in contrast with services where a security context remains present on a server, the claims of the pending application provided security for applications in which there is no permanent context or session. Instead, a new context is created with new invocations from one application to another.

Silhavy is directed to a multi-platform single sign-on database driver. Silhavy discloses creating a security context that continues for a session. Thus, Silhavy discloses creating a single context for any communications between the application and the database during the session. Stated another way, Silhavy discloses creating *a single continuing context for all of the requests* of the database by the application during the session. Accordingly, Silhavy does not disclose creating *a new context with every invocation of functionality* of the distinct server application by the client application. Reeves does not cure the deficiencies of Silhavy.

This distinction, as well as others, will be discussed in greater detail in the analysis of the present claims that follows.

Detailed Response**Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Silhavy or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Reeves.

I. Silhavy in view of Reeves does not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application.

Amended claim 1 recites “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application.” Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added and support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification as originally filed, including at least paragraphs 0027, 0030, 0051, 0053-0055.

The Office Action relied on Figure 3 (i.e., steps 310 and 330) and paragraphs 0007 and 0034 of Silhavy to disclose the above limitations.

While step 330 of Figure 3 and paragraphs 0007 and 0034 of Silhavy may disclose that a security context is created, Applicants respectfully submit that Silhavy does not disclose that a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application. In the interview, Applicants and Examiner Abedin agreed that Silhavy discloses creating a security context that continues for a session. Thus, Silhavy discloses creating a single context for all communications between the application and the database during the session. For example, Applicants note paragraph 0033 of Silhavy which discloses,

After the security context has been created 330, it is initialized 340 for communications...Subsequent to initialization 340, communications 342 between the client driver 100 and database 150 takes place. During a computing session, application 120 uses driver 100 to make requests of database 150 over secure connection 220, and replies are sent from database server 150 back through driver 100 to application 120. (Emphasis added).

In contrast to Silhavy, claim 1 requires that a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application. Thus, referring again to paragraph 0033 of Silhavy provided above, claim 1 would require that a new context is created with every request (i.e., invocation of functionality) of the database 150 by the application 120 during the computing session, which is clearly not disclosed by Silhavy.

Turning now to Figure 3, Applicants respectfully submit that a number of potential interpretations exist, each of will be addressed below. However, none of the potential interpretations of Figure 3 of Silhavy result in the creation of a new context with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application, as claimed. The Office Action appears to interpret step 310 ("Launch Application") as the claimed invocation. However, mere disclosure of launching an application on a computer does not teach or suggest that the application invokes functionality of a separate application. Thus, step 310 does not teach or suggest the claimed invocation.

Another potential interpretation of Figure 3 would be to interpret step 320 ("Request Access to Database") as the claimed invocation. However, Applicants respectfully submit that step 320 cannot be interpreted as the claimed invocation because merely requesting access to a database (i.e., a connection) does not teach or

suggest requesting a functionality of the database. Assuming for the sake of argument that requesting access to a database teaches or suggests requesting a functionality of the database, which Applicants do not admit, Figure 3 still would not disclose that a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application. For example, while Figure 3 of Silhavy may disclose that a security context is created (i.e., step 330) after the application requests access to the database (i.e., step 320), Applicants note step 342 which discloses the communications between the application and the database. Paragraph 0033 of Silhavy discussed in detail above discloses that during step 342, the application makes requests (i.e., invocations of functionality) of the database. However, Applicants note that Figure 3 does not disclose that a new context is created with step 342, let alone that a new context is created with every request of the database by the application that occurs during step 342. Rather, the same context created in step 330 continues.

As discussed in the preceding paragraph, Silhavy discloses that during step 342, the application makes requests of the database. Thus, another potential interpretation of Figure 3 of Silhavy would be to interpret step 342 (“Connection Established/Communication”) as the claimed invocation. However, Silhavy does not disclose that a new security context is created with every request of the database by the application that occurs in step 342. Instead, Silhavy discloses that the same security context created in step 330 continues for every request of the database by the application during the session. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Silhavy in view of Reeves does not teach or suggest that there is no continuing context or

session and a new context is created with every invocation of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application.

For at least the reasons established above in section I, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated, taught or suggested by Sihavy and Reeves and respectfully request allowance of this claim.

Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view of Silhavy further in view of Reeves.

Claim 9 includes limitations substantially similar to the limitations discussed in section I above. For example, amended claim 9 now recites “wherein there is no continuing context or session and a new context is created with each of a plurality of invocations of functionality of the distinct server application by the client application.” Accordingly, the arguments of section I are hereby repeated for claim 9.

For at least the reasons established above in section I, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is not taught or suggested by Bhatia and respectfully request allowance of this claim. Neither Silhavy nor Reeves cure the deficiencies of Bhatia.

Rejection of Remaining Claims

Claims 2-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Silhavy or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Reeves.

Claims 10-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia in view of Silhavy further in view of Reeves.

Claim 34 is added herein. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support may be found throughout the specification as originally filed, including at least paragraphs 0030, 0051, 0053-0055.

The remaining claims 2-8, 10-27, and 34 all depend on claims 1 or 9 and Applicants submit that none of the other applied references cures the deficiencies of the cited art discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claims 2-8, 10-27, and 34 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons established above.

Response to Objections

Claim 13 was objected to because of an informality. Claim 13 has been amended to read – the information related to the token is the token itself -- as suggested in the Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank Examiner Abedin for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 28 and 30-33. Applicants note that claim 28 has been amended merely to correct a typographical error.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2010

/Michael W. Piper/
Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5601 Granite Parkway, Suite 750
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS